



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,726	02/14/2001	Mihal Lazaridis	1400-1072 D2	7167
82297	7590	04/13/2012	EXAMINER	
The Danamraj Law Group, PC/RIM Attn: Reba Pieczynski Premier Place, Suite 1450 5910 N. Central Expressway Dallas, TX 75206			STRANGE, AARON N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2448	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2012	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

portfolioprosecution@rim.com
uspto-inbox@danamraj.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/783,726	LAZARIDIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AARON STRANGE	2448	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2012.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 102-109,111,112 and 122-129 is/are pending in the application.
 - 5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 102-109,111,112 and 122-129 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20111102; 20111208</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/9/2012 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. With regard to claim 102, and Applicant's assertion that Eggleston/Airmobile teach "a virtual session based communication architecture that necessitates a connection with the mobile client" (Remarks 12-15), the Examiner generally agrees to the extent that the client sends a registration message to the server and receives a response from the server to establish the virtual session (Eggleston; col. 6, ll. 23-55).

However, it is important to note that Eggleston specifically distinguishes the "virtual session" from a "regular session" (Eggleston; col. 6, ll. 52-55), and that data is delivered to the client "in a sessionless mode" via the "virtual session" (Eggleston; col. 7, ll. 10-14).

Furthermore, the current claims do not completely preclude use of a session, virtual or otherwise. The current claims merely require the step of "causing to continuously redirect the user data items" without establishing a connection session. Since Eggleston discloses that the data is delivered (equivalent to the redirection step) "in a sessionless mode" (Eggleston; col. 7, ll. 10-14), it is clear that this step is performed "without establishing a connection session". At most, Eggleston appears to establish a connection session during a client registration step, which occurs before any

redirection happens, and no language in the current claims precludes such an operation from occurring.

3. With further regard to claim 102, and Applicant's assertion that the "Eggleston/Airmobile system is incapable of continuous redirection of user data items as claimed" (Remarks 18-21), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. A similar argument was previously addressed in the Office action of 11/9/2011 (§4-5). The Examiner submits that Applicant has failed to explain how a "virtual session based communication system that involves querying of a mail server" (Remarks 18) differs from a system that "continuously redirect[s]" messages. Neither use of a "virtual session" nor "querying of a mail server" is inconsistent with continuously redirecting user data items to a mobile device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 102-109, 111, 112 and 122-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

6. With regard to claim 102, the limitation “causing to continuously redirect the user data items, *without establishing a connection session*,” (emphasis added) is not described in the specification. The specification does not contain the term “session” or “connection session”, and includes no disclosure directed to redirecting data items while specifically excluding the establishment of a connection session.

The specification simply remains silent regarding the establishment of a connection session. A lack of disclosure regarding an operation is insufficient to provide written description support of a limitation specifically excluding the operation.

7. Claim 122 contains a substantially identical limitation and is rejected under the same rationale.

8. All claims not individually rejected are rejected by virtue of their dependency from the above claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 102-104, 106-109, 111, 122 and 124-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile (Software for Lotus cc:Mail Wireless, Communication Client Guide, Motorola, 1995) in view of Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,899, hereinafter "Eggleston").

11. With regard to claim 102, AirMobile discloses a method of pushing user data items from a messaging host system ("communication server") to a wireless mobile data communications device that is associated with a user having a mailbox at the messaging host system (p. 9, "Communication Server," p. 10, "User Profile Database," pp. 15-16, wherein mail is received and stored at the communication server, and the mail account is associated with a mobile device according the device ID), the method comprising:

receiving notifications at a redirector component indicating receipt of user data items by the messaging host system, where the notifications are received in response to receipt of the user data items at the messaging host system (newly received messages are immediately downloaded when they arrive)(p. 30-31);

processing the user data items by the redirector component to add address information associated with the wireless mobile data communication device (required for delivery to the mobile client)(g. 31, ¶1-3);

causing to redirect the user data items, without establishing a connection session (messages are delivered "without maintaining a session")(p. 30), to the wireless mobile

data communication device over a wireless network (messages are pushed to the portable PC)(p. 31).

While AirMobile discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it fails to specifically disclose that the user data items are “continuously redirected”, regardless of the availability of the wireless device.

Eggleston discloses a similar system for redirecting messages to a wireless device. Eggleston teaches continuously redirecting data items via a virtual session and identifies the procedure for removing a client from active status and stop attempting to deliver data as a process that is *“preferably included in the VSM”* (col. 7, ll. 37-40). A preferable feature is not required, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood Eggleston’s disclosure to mean that the system properly operate, albeit less efficiently, with this feature removed. Therefore, Eggleston at least suggests a system where messages are continuously forwarded, regardless of the availability of the client device. Eggleston additionally discloses that messages are delivered “without establishing a connection session” (col. 7, ll. 10-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to continuously forward the data items to the mobile device, regardless of the device’s availability, to ensure the client will be immediately notified of outbound data upon its return to availability, without requiring the device to login again (Eggleston; col. 7, ll. 37-58).

12. With regard to claim 103, AirMobile disclosed the redirector component is operating on the messaging host system (pg 9 "communication server" and pg 31 ¶s 1-3).

13. With regard to claim 104, AirMobile disclosed the' redirector component is operating on a host system that is couple to the message host system via the network (e.g. the Network file server cc:Mail Postoffice works in tandem with the Windows AirMobile server pg 9).

14. With regard to claim 106, Eggleston disclosed that messages sent between the wired and wireless systems can be compressed (col. 11, lines 63-67). Given this knowledge, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to compress the messages, prior to transmission to the gateway, and to decompress the messages at the mobile device, as suggested by Eggleston, in order to increase available bandwidth and to provide faster and less expensive communications (see Eggleston, col. 12, lines 7-9).

15. With regard to claim 107, AirMobile disclosed the processing step further comprises encoding the copy of the user data item (e.g. transforming a message into the required transmission protocol for the wireless network being utilizing prior to pushing a message to the user) (additionally compressing as set forth with regard to claim 106 is a form of encoding).

16. With regard to claim 108, Examiner takes official notice that the Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions protocol was widely known and used to communicate email messages between devices at the time of Applicant's invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to encode messages using the MIME protocol within AirMobile' s system in order to communicate messages between devices using a known reliable protocol.

17. With regard to claim 109, AirMobile disclosed the user data items comprise email mesasges (pg. 38, "Sending/Transmitting e-mail messages").

18. With regard to claim 111, AirMobile disclosed that the user data items are continuously redirected to the wireless mobile data communication device over the wireless network via a wireless gateway disposed between a wide area network and the wireless network (see pg 9, Figure 1-1, a gateway is required to interface between the networks).

19. With regard to claim 112, AirMobile disclosed the step of storing the user data item at the data store associated with the messaging host system (p. 9, "Communication Server," p. 10, "User Profile Database," pp. 15-16, wherein mail is received and stored at the communication server, and the mail account is associated with a mobile device according the device ID).

20. Claims 122 and 124-129 are rejected using a similar rationale as applied to claims 102-104, 106-109, 111 and 112.

21. Claims 105 and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile Server (AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail, Communication Server Guide, Motorola, 1995), in view of AirMobile Client (AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail, Communication Client Guide, Motorola, 1995) further in view of Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,899, hereinafter "Eggleston") further in view of Murota (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,105).

Note, the AirMobile Server and AirMobile Client guide present different aspects of the same system, and are therefore treated as a single system for the purposes of this rejection. They are hereinafter referred to together as "AirMobile" with specific citations to the Server • guide as "AirMobileS" and the Client guide as "AirMobileC."

22. With regard to claim 105 and 123, AirMobileS disclosed sending messages from the cc:Mail server to the mobile device in a secure fashion (AirMobileS, p. 25, bullet 1 "secure and authenticated virtual wireless communication channel between your laptop and your LAN-based cc:Mail server") however, AirMobile does not disclose using encryption for sending messages in a secure fashion. Nonetheless the use of encryption to send messages securely was widely known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention, as evidenced by at least Murota.

In a similar email system, Murota disclosed encrypting e-mail messages between a sender and a receiver, wherein a message is encrypted at the sending end, is then transmitted over the network to the receiving end, and is finally decrypted at the receiving computer (col. 1, lines 23-48). Murota further disclosed that such an encryption scheme is advantageous because it prevents leaks of secret information to outside, non-intended parties (Murota, col. 1, lines 49-53).

Thus, given the teaching of Murota, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention include an encryption function, as taught by Murota, in conjunction with the redirector component of AirMobile such that messages sent between the AirMobile server and mobile devices are encrypted, in order to prevent outside parties from having access to secret or classified messages.

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is (571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Strange/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448